



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

broadly popular. The student of folk-lore in particular will find that many apt parallels for his mythological researches are furnished by the Indo-Iranian gods, demons, and genii of sky, earth, and water, who benevolently preside over or maliciously plague the life of man. There is, on the whole, less of real mythology in the ancient tales of Persia than in those of India. Professor Carnoy is inclined to see in the manifold struggle between the heroes of Iran and the demons or barbarians the reflection of a primitive storm-myth; but, as he himself admits, much of the Persian legendary material may be accounted for by the principle of euhemerism. Professor Keith likewise tends to favor mythological rather than historical explanations, notably in his treatment of the life of the Buddha; but everywhere in both parts there is evidence of sound scholarship and wise judgment.

A highly commendable feature of the work is the addition of some fifty illustrations, in photogravure or in color, which serve admirably to elucidate the text. The skilled hand of the editor-in-chief is doubtless to be discerned in the "tissues" with explanatory text, which are tipped in between the pages so as to front each illustration. One may perhaps regret that there are not in the letter-press some guiding head-lines or black-face type to introduce the different topics in each chapter, but the general arrangement is logical and clear. The notes and bibliography at the end of the volume will be found extremely useful.

A. V. W. J.

THE MYTHOLOGY OF ALL RACES. In thirteen volumes. LOUIS HERBERT GRAY, A.M., Ph.D., Editor; GEORGE FOOT MOORE, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor. Volume XII: Egyptian, by W. MAX MÜLLER, Ph.D.; Indo-Chinese Mythology, by Sir JAMES GEORGE SCOTT. Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 1918. xiv + 450 p., 21 pl., 232 text figs. Large 8°.

PROFESSOR MÜLLER has undertaken a difficult task in his presentation of Egyptian Mythology, and has carried it through in a highly creditable manner. The scanty myths, their heterodox character, the ultra-conservatism of the Egyptians in religious matters, and the absence of clearly-formulated religious doctrines, — all render the task a trying one.

The paper is very thoroughly annotated, — sixty-eight pages of eight-point notes to two hundred and forty-five pages of ten-point text. In addition, the whole structure of the paper is securely tied together with an abundance of parenthetical cross-reference. The typography is good, and it bears the ear-marks of careful proof-reading. The absence of a separate index is to be regretted, however.

The author seeks "to emphasize two principles more than has been done hitherto: (a) the comparative view — Egyptian religion had by no means so isolated a growth as has generally been assumed; (b) as in many other religions, its doctrines often found a greater degree of expression in religious art than in religious literature, so that modern interpreters should make more use of the Egyptian pictures."

In his discussions of origin and development, the author very wisely avoids the quicksands of totemic origins. He refers to totemism in the text but once, in speaking of "the strange local divine symbols which remind us

of totemistic emblems." He seeks the origin of the Egyptian religion in animism. He assumes "that the Egyptian pantheon had its origin in the most remote and obscure neolithic (or perhaps even palæolithic) age, and we may safely consider it a product of a most primitive barbarism." He lays particular stress upon the early solarization of various deities. Ancestor worship, which by some has been considered the starting-point of the Osirian worship, Professor Müller discards.

The author quite properly dwells upon the ultra-conservatism of the Egyptians in religious matters, and shows that much of the confusion and lack of formulation of the religion is due to this very tendency. The early established canons of art are one manifestation of this tendency. I think, however, that the author goes too far when he states: "For example, all the pictures of Ptah, one of the oldest gods, point back to a clumsy type betraying an age when the artists were not yet able to separate arms and legs from the body." I do not think such was ever the case. Certainly child drawings and the work of palæolithic and Bushman artists seem to testify to the contrary.

In a note Professor Müller states his position in reference to the hypothetical prehistoric Egyptian totemism. His stand is so very sensible, that I quote him in full: "Scholars have often tried to find traces of totemism in the symbols of the gods, the cities, and the districts of Egypt. Such an interpretation is especially tempting when these emblems, carried on a standard as the coat of arms of the nomes, represent an animal or a plant. The only statement which we can positively make is that the Egyptians in historic times were not conscious of a totemistic explanation of these symbols. Their application was divine or local, never tribal like the totemistic symbols of primitive peoples."

In answer to the proponents of the theory that the Egyptian religion represents a degenerated monotheism or henotheism, Professor Müller ably summarizes the facts, and relegates the Egyptian religion to its proper position, as originating from "an endless and unsystematic polytheism which betrays an originally animistic basis."

The worship of the sun, and the identification of various deities with the sun-god, are discussed in Chapter II. The early and widespread worship of the sun-god, Professor Müller considers, also arose from animism; for, as he remarks, "a nation which discovers divine spirits in every remarkable tree or rock will find them even more readily in the sun, the moon, the stars, and the like."

Chapter II describes the sun-god; and Chapter III, "other gods connected with nature." The various concepts of the universe are succinctly presented, and the numerous aspects of the deities who assumed cosmic rôles are discussed. The assimilation of many of these deities one to another through the long course of Egyptian history, owing to similarity of function, is emphasized by the author.

Under the heading "Some Cosmic and Cosmogonic Myths," more or less fragmentary tales are presented in Chapter IV, under the headings, (1) "The Creation of the World and of Men;" (2) "The Destruction of Mankind;" (3) "Why the Sun-God withdrew from Earth;" (4) "The Sun-God, Isis, and the Serpent;" (5) "How the Moon became Ruler of the Night;" (6) "The Lost Eye of the Sun-God." These stories are probably but a

small portion of the tales which were current in ancient Egypt. This collection, small as it is, presents numerous difficulties of interpretation, which Professor Müller meets in masterly fashion. These difficulties are largely due to the conservatism of the Egyptians, who sought to incorporate in each written story, not only more than one version, but often quite distinct tales. The various elements were frequently so incongruous as to preclude any possibility of harmonizing them.

In Chapter V Professor Müller discusses the gods of the Osirian cycle, stressing particularly the evolution and accretion of ideas concerning the deities of the cycle. The identification of the thunder-god Sêth with the dragon 'Apop he lays to the influence of the Babylonian myth of Tîāmat. "After 2500 B.C. the Asiatic myth of the combat between the god of heaven and light (Bêl-Marduk, etc.) and the abysmal dragon of the ocean (Tîāmat) penetrated into Egypt, where it gave rise to the story of the gigantic serpent 'Apop, the enemy of the sun-god."

Professor Müller introduces his chapter upon "The Osirian Cycle" with the following sentence: "At a very early time a special group of gods, all local in origin, was brought into a mutual connection, which gave rise to an extremely rich growth of myths that overshadowed all other mythology and thus made those divinities the most popular, not only of Egypt, but subsequently of the whole ancient world." The ultimate origin of this most important feature of the religion of ancient Egypt he discusses with justifiable caution in the latter portion of the chapter: "Until we know more completely the Babylonian form of the legend of Tammuz, it is unsafe to derive the Osiris-myth wholly from Asia. It is quite probable that its primitive ideas came from Asia; but if this be so, they had an early, rich, and rather independent development in Egypt, whence a portion of them wandered back to Asia. It is particularly noteworthy that it was only in Egypt that Osiris developed into a judge of the dead. Isis, on the other hand, is a rather meaningless and colourless character compared with her original, the Asiatic goddess of love." This hypothesis contrasts strongly with the views in certain other Egyptological quarters, that the Osiris worship may be rooted in ancestor worship of indigenous African origin.

"Some Texts Referring to Osiris-Myths" are presented in Chapter VI, under the following headings: (1) "The Dirge of Isis and Nephthys," (2) "The Pig in the Sun's Eye," (3) "The Tears of Isis," (4) "Isis in the Combat of Horus and Seth," (5) "The Destruction of the Dragon 'Apop."

A catalogue of "the other principal gods" is presented in alphabetic order in Chapter VII. The author briefly enumerates the various forms, localizations, and principal attributes of over one hundred deities.

Chapter VIII is of interest, not so much for the list of foreign gods which it contains, as for the fact that the author here states his position as to Asiatic and Nubian influence upon the religion of Egypt. "The Egyptians of the earlier period did not feel it necessary to bring foreign gods to their country; when they went to Syria and Nubia, they temporarily worshipped the local divinities of those lands, without abandoning their own deities. It is true that the concepts of Asiatic mythology constantly passed freely into the religion of Egypt, and in particular, the fairy stories of the New Empire not only employed Asiatic *motifs* very liberally, but often placed their scenes in Asia, thus frankly confessing their dependence on Asiatic material. . . .

From folk-lore and magic, sooner or later such ideas finally passed into the official theology; and future scholars will ultimately recognize that a very considerable part of Egyptian religious thought was derived from or influenced by the mythology of Asia. Tracing such *motifs* to the Pyramid period certainly does not prove that they were autochthonous."

He acknowledges the debt to Africa in pointing out the Libyan origin of the goddess Shahdidi, introduced after 1000 B.C., and by emphasizing that the Egyptians of the earliest times worshipped some Nubian gods. As compared with the debt claimed for Africa by certain other Egyptologists, Professor Müller lays her under very light contribution indeed. In a measure, however, he strikes a balance between the two sources of influence, Asia and Africa, and perhaps comes nearer the truth than do those who are ultra-Asiatic or ultra-African in their views.

Chapter IX is of much importance for understanding Professor Müller's views as to the origin and development of a notorious feature of Egyptian worship, the cult of animals. It is of interest to note that the author avoids the field of totemism as explaining the cult, and contends that the supposed supernatural powers of animals were the basis of their worship, and that their identification with the gods is a later growth.

The worship of men also is discussed in Chapter IX. The chief examples cited are the Pharaohs themselves and the deified scholars I-m-hotep and Amen-hotep. In the last paragraph Professor Müller takes the following stand with regard to ancestor worship:—

"Generally speaking, all the dead might be worshipped on the theory that as blessed spirits they lived with the gods in a state of illumination and sanctification. Their chapels were, however, places to pray for them rather than to pray to them; and the sacrifices offered there were not to win their intercession, but served merely to maintain their hungry souls. Contrary to the usual belief, therefore, the worship of ancestors, as we shall see in the following chapter, was not so clearly and strongly developed in ancient Egypt as among some other peoples."

A synopsis of the multifarious Egyptian views concerning life after death forms Chapter X. "Ethics and Cult" are discussed in Chapter XI, and "Magic" in Chapter XII. In the latter chapter the author sounds a note of warning to "some scholars [who] brand as magic all the customs intended to secure eternal life for the dead or to improve their state." In this connection it is worth while to quote the second paragraph of the chapter in full; for it manifests the author's viewpoint as to the interrelations of Egyptian magic and religion, and also his nicety of discrimination:—

"The very *naïve* Egyptian spirit, which was so unable to distinguish between the material and the supernatural, and the excessive formalism of the worship, give us the impression that the whole religion of the Nile-land had a strongly magic character. This is true of most religions which are based on animism; yet we may easily go too far, as when, for example, some scholars brand as magic all the customs intended to secure eternal life for the dead or to improve their state. It is quite true that the assertion of a funerary text that the dead go to heaven may be understood as a prayer; but a prayer which is sure to be efficacious, and a wish passing into reality in vivid imagination, indeed border on magic, — a statement which is equally true of the numerous ceremonies and amulets which mechanically benefit

the soul of the dead. The *Book of the Dead*, with its directions how to find the way to Osiris, what to say before him, what words to recite, and what mysterious names to give to the guardians of his realm, presents a close approximation to magic; yet, after all, it is no secret knowledge, but is open to all who can read, and therefore does not fall under the modern definition of sorcery; neither did the Egyptians themselves consider it magical."

The thirteenth and final chapter is concerned with the "Development and Propagation of Egyptian Religion." The author points out that "at first glance it would seem that the religion of ancient Egypt had been successfully stereotyped in prehistoric times," yet many gradual changes in religious thought and the growth and decay of creeds and forms of worship are discernible. The author then proceeds to outline the religious development, prefacing his synopsis with a characteristic caution: "Are we quite certain, for example, that one of the most primitive specimens of religious fancy, that the king's soul lives by cannibalism on other souls, even those of the gods, goes back to a time before 5000 B.C., when the dwellers in the valley of the Nile may well have been real cannibals? Could not a loyal magician's fancy wander thus far even in the age of highest civilization? On the other hand, it is not safe to assume that some isolated and remarkable advances of thought in these texts — e.g., a certain moral standard demanded even for the king, if he is to be admitted to the realm of the gods — could not be much earlier than the great development of Egyptian civilization, which begins about 3000 B.C."

Animism, in Professor Müller's belief, forms the underlying stratum of the vast and intricate superstructure of conflicting beliefs and practices which constituted the religion of the ancient Egyptians. The various steps of development as they can be traced in the ancient texts and pictures are then outlined, — the solarization of the pantheon, which "is traceable at least as early as the First Dynasty;" the formation of triads and enneads; "the comparison and identification (syncretism) of similar gods;" the growth of pantheistic tendencies after 1600 B.C. "Foreign influences cannot be discovered in any of the developments which we have thus far considered. The borrowing of Asiatic *motifs* by Egyptian mythology could never revolutionize Egyptian thought, nor could this be done by a few Asiatic deities which enjoyed worship in Egypt at one period. These foreign cults existed side by side with the ancient Egyptian worships, neither mingling with them nor affecting them." Lastly, the author discusses the spread of Egyptian beliefs beyond the borders of Egypt.

In the opinion of the reviewer, Professor Müller's work is a valuable contribution to Egyptological literature. His treatment of the subject is exceedingly well balanced. He does not attempt to derive the Egyptian religion from Babylonia or elsewhere, yet he is willing enough to admit the presence of foreign *motifs* here and there. The student has in Professor Müller's work a most convenient handbook of Egyptian mythology, which concisely summarizes what is known of the subject to the beginning of 1918. Although primarily an exposition of the author's own views, it nevertheless takes cognizance of conflicting views and theories through the medium of extensive notes and a bibliography.

EDWARD WINSLOW GIFFORD.

THE name of Sir Scott is well known to me as one of the authors of the *Gazetteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*, in five volumes, — a solid repository of facts, which has accompanied me through fifteen years as a faithful and helpful companion. The ethnography and history of Indo-China are in the initial stages, and present an endless series of most complex problems. Numerous tribes are still unexplored. Of the mythologies, we know little; and reliable text-material is scanty. In view of this situation, we have every reason to be grateful to the author for having undertaken the difficult task of writing for the general public an intelligible account of the mythological concepts prevailing in this vast area. It is less pure mythology than popular religion, folk-lore, spirit-worship, and festivals, which form the subjects of the work; but all this is recounted well, and admirably fulfils its purpose. More than that, this summary will doubtless act as an incentive to further active research in this field. Sir Scott has wisely confined himself to a presentation of his material, and, aside from a few occasional remarks, avoids theoretical discussions. I do not know whether any other living scholar would have acquitted himself of his obligation in a more creditable manner. The illustrations are well chosen, being chiefly borrowed from Sir R. C. Temple's "*The Thirty-Seven Nats*." The title of the publication is to be understood as the mythology of the peoples of Indo-China. "*Indo-Chinese*" is somewhat misleading, as by "*Indo-Chinese*" we are wont to understand a linguistic family including the Chinese, Tibetans, many Himalaya and Assam tribes, Burmese, Siamese, etc., but to the exclusion of the Mon-Khmer. It would lead me too far to offer here even the briefest outline of my own views on the subject; and I therefore restrict myself to a few observations on points of detail, addressed to the author and the editor of the series, for their consideration in the second edition of the work, which it is hoped will soon become necessary.

The notes on the Bodhisatva Avalokiteçvara (p. 262) do not conform to the present state of science. He cannot be regarded as sexless or as having "by nature neither sex nor form." He assuredly was a male deity; and his transformation into a goddess in China is a comparatively recent event, due to the amalgamation with an ancient Taoist goddess. Such adjustments of native deities with imported Buddhist forms have been common wherever Buddhism has gained a foothold. The Chinese did not receive the conception of this Bodhisatva "by way of Tibet," but straight from India. In connection with the Deluge legends of Indo-China (p. 267), those of the Lo-lo should be considered (P. Vial, "*Les Lolos*," p. 61; A. Liétard, "*Au Yun-nan, Les Lo-lo-p'o*," p. 140). The author states (p. 268) that the traditions of the Siamese are possibly grafted on faint memories of the legends which they brought with them from Ta-li fu, the old capital of the Nan-chao kingdom. Such legends are, in fact, preserved in the Chinese records of the history of the Nan-chao dynasty (see, for instance, this *Journal*, 30: 421). The "river of running sand" in the traditions of the Karen (p. 269) is not necessarily to be interpreted as the Desert of Gobi; at least, this is not convincing. Still less is it conceivable that their legends should suggest an acquaintance with the Jewish colonies in China, or even with the Nestorian pillar at Si-ngan fu. The small number of Jewish immigrants into China, who were chiefly settled at K'ai-fong in Ho-nan, have never been able to exert the slightest influence on their surroundings,

but, on the contrary, have been so completely sinicized that they are now almost extinct. Nestorianism left no trace on the thought of Chinese society. The inscription in question is written in such an exalted and highly literary style, that it is quite unintelligible to the people; and its technical terminology is a complete mystery to the present scholars of China. No popular influence can be attributed to such a monument.

The opinion that St. Thomas is known in China under the name Ta-mo (p. 270) is unfounded. This belief was expressed by the early missionaries, but was abandoned long ago, also by the learned Jesuits of China (cf. L. Gaillard, "*Croix et Swastika en Chine*," p. 83). Chinese *ta-mo* was anciently pronounced *d'at-ma or *d'ar-ma, and represents an exact transcription of Sanskrit *dharma* ("law, religion"). The name Ta-mo is abbreviated for Bodhidharma, who is counted as the twenty-eighth Indian or the first Chinese patriarch, and who came to China with the alms-bowl of Buddha in A.D. 520 (not about the beginning of our era). He plays a prominent rôle in Chinese and Japanese art; and it is correct, as stated by Sir Scott, that there is a picture of his (engraved in a stone tablet) in the Pei-lin (not ling) of Si-ngan fu, but there is none in any Confucian temple: that would be plain sacrilege in the eyes of the Chinese.

The Annamese are positively not of "Sinitic (or Chinese) origin" (p. 287). For their mythology and religion, the books of P. Giran ("*Magie et religion annamites*," Paris, 1912) and E. Diguët ("*Les Annamites, société, coutumes, religions*," Paris, 1906) would have furnished many useful contributions. I regret that the author has not incorporated in his sketch the mythology of the Malayan Cham, for which we have excellent texts and translations in A. Cabaton's "*Nouvelles recherches sur les Chams*" (Paris, 1901).

Can it truly be said that "the Chinese believe less in spirits (except ancestral spirits) than any other race in Asia" (p. 398)? (See Doré's "*Recherches sur les superstitions en Chine*.") In the bibliography, of Cordier's "*Bibliotheca indosinica*," only the first volume (Paris, 1912) is quoted. This work, however, was complete long ago in four volumes, the last having appeared in 1914. An article on "Nat-Worship among the Burmese," from the pen of L. Vossion, was published in this Journal for 1891.

The editor should not have failed to add an explanatory note as to the reasons why this section is yoked together with Egyptian mythology in a single volume. The layman will stand aghast, or may even suspect that some mysterious association connects the two. It is an editorial error, that the Egyptian notes and bibliography, which in the table of contents are hidden away under the heading "Indo-Chinese" without any mark of separation, are put after the Indo-Chinese mythology instead of being placed with the Egyptian section. If reasons of convenience enforced this unfortunate combination, the solution of the problem was quite simple: each section should have been printed as a perfect and separate unit, with a distinct title-page, and the common binding would have insured the same result, from the publisher's viewpoint. The title-page with the double title, as it stands, conveys a bad impression.

B. LAUFER.

FIELD MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY,
CHICAGO, ILL.